



CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM BUDGET WORKSHEET
2015 / 2016
Project Information Sheet

This form MUST be completed for each project requested for funding in the 2015-2016 Capital Budget. Use a separate form for each project, and please prioritize each project 1 through X, with 1 representing your highest priority and X the lowest.

Department Name:	Engineering / Streets
Priority Ranking:	1
Project Title:	East Third Street Resurfacing – Scott Street to Winchester Street
Quantity (if applicable):	0.58 miles
Project Useful Life:	15-20 years pavement, 50 years curbs
Cost Estimates:	Current FY Project Request: \$660,000 Prior Funding: \$40,000 Total Project Cost: \$700,000
Projected Schedule of Purchase:	Design completed in February 2015, construction completed by November 1, 2015.
Source of Funding:	\$227,000 Federal Aid funds, \$433,000 Major Street Fund
Purpose of Expenditure:	Milling and resurfacing of existing pavement to 3" depth, including replacement of all curb and gutter (except between Kentucky and Winchester), sidewalk ramps, and driveway approaches, along with associated work such as drainage structure rehabilitation and / or adjustment to final grades.
Project Justification:	The pavement and curbs along this roadway are in poor condition and are eligible for Federal funding. The last resurfacing was performed in 1987 (Scott to Kentucky) and 1986 (Kentucky to Winchester).
Projected Budget Impact:	City has \$227,000 available in Federal obligational authority through the MAP-21 Federal Transportation Bill for 2015, with the remaining funds coming from the Major Street Fund. \$40,000 in design funding was appropriated from the Major Street Fund for the 14-15 fiscal year.

Check those items that apply:

Type of Project:	<input type="checkbox"/> Equipment	<input type="checkbox"/> Vehicle	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project
Status of Request:	<input type="checkbox"/> New Request <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funding Requested in Prior Year		
Status of Item or Project:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Replacing Existing Equipment, Vehicle, Etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Equipment, Vehicle, Etc. that is New to the City		

Please answer the following questions related this request.

1. Has this project been requested previously? If so, when? Was funding awarded? If yes, how much?
<p>Yes, \$40,000 for survey and design engineering was requested and funded through the FY 14-15 CIP.</p>

2. Description and function of new capital item:
<p>Milling and resurfacing of existing pavement to 3" depth, including replacement of all curb and gutter (except between Kentucky and Winchester), sidewalk ramps, and driveway approaches, along with associated work such as drainage structure rehabilitation and / or adjustment to final grades.</p>

3. Why is this item needed? Why does the City need to provide this service?
<p>The pavement and curbs along this roadway are in poor condition and are eligible for Federal funding. The last resurfacing was performed in 1987 (Scott to Kentucky) and 1986 (Kentucky to Winchester).</p>

4. Explain new or improved service that will result from new item and impact on your department's performance or services provided:

Improvement of roadway surface for the traveling public.

5. What will be the operating budget cost or savings? (List costs/savings for personnel, supplies, and other charges separately).

Approximately \$1,000 annually in continuing maintenance such as asphalt cold patching of roadway surface.

6. Does the proposed project comply with the City's Comprehensive Plan?

Yes, street rehabilitation is inherent to the protection of the public safety and welfare. Specific references include Chapter 3 (Transportation) – pages 11, 12, and 15, and Chapter 12 (Implementation) – page 75.

7. Are there other alternatives to the proposed item or request? (E.g., lease vs. buy, repair rather than replace, share with other governmental jurisdictions, etc.)

Milling and resurfacing could be limited to one course (1-1/2") only, however, recent experience with high-volume major streets indicates that this method does little to truly improve the surface more than a few years and generally leads to reflective cracking from the underlying layers in a few years as well. Full-scale reconstruction in concrete could be considered, but costs would be significantly higher in the near term for this alternative, and would result in excessive maintenance of traffic impacts to adjacent residents.

8. How is the cost proposed to be funded? Are there alternative sources of funding? (E.g., donations, millages, special assessments, grants, etc.)

City has \$227,000 available in Federal obligational authority through the MAP-21 Federal Transportation Bill for 2015, with the remaining funds coming from the Major Street Fund. \$40,000 in design funding was appropriated from the Major Street Fund for the 14-15 fiscal year.

In theory, Special Assessment is a viable alternative, but must be implemented as a City-wide policy before it should be considered for this project. Also, since this roadway somewhat serves the City at large, it is probably inappropriate for special assessment to the fronting property owners alone.

Resurfacing of this roadway is theoretically eligible for funding through the City's Community Development Block Grant program, but the cost exceeds our annual entitlement and it would not be cost effective to split this roadway into multiple segments as would be needed.

9. Are there opportunities to share costs and services with other governmental units within the region?

No, maintenance and rehabilitation of roadways within the City's jurisdiction are entirely City responsibility.

10. Insert a photo/drawing, or cut-sheet of the site or equipment if available.



11. For fixed projects, Include a map of the project location if applicable and/or appropriate.

Master map of all Streets and Infrastructure locations is being provided separately for clarity.